

3-10-2015

March 10, 2015

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins)

---

### Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "March 10, 2015" (2015). *Minutes*. 1023.  
[https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins/1023](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1023)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact [tabruns@eiu.edu](mailto:tabruns@eiu.edu).

## FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

10 March 2015 meeting

(The 2014-2015 Faculty Senate agendas, minutes, and other information are available on the Web at:

<http://castle.eiu.edu/facsen/>)

\* Note: These minutes **are not** a complete verbatim transcript of the Senate meeting. (J. Oliver)

### I. Call to Order by Chair Sterling at 2:00pm (Booth Library, Room 4440)

Present: J. Ashley, T. Bruns, J. Conwell, M. Dao, S. Eckert, J. Ludlow, M. Mulvaney, J. Oliver, G. Sterling, J. Stowell, D. Viertel, S. Ahmad (Student VP).

Guests: J. Blitz (CHEM), B. Lord (AA), M. Herrington-Perry (AA), M. Gronnvoll (CMN), J. Jarmon (DEN), R. Jones (CMN), R. Siegel (Staff Senate), R. Throneburg (CDS)

### II. Approval of Minutes of 24 February 2015

- Minutes from 24 February 2015 Senate meeting were approved.
- Motion made by Senator Conwell, and seconded by Senator Bruns. All in favor? – 10/11
- Abstentions = 1 (Eckert)

### III. Communications

- a. CAA Minutes from 2/19/15 and 2/26/15
- b. Affordability Analysis and EIU3 from Senator Stowell
- c. Faculty Election Information (Vacancies, Nominations Form, Questions, and E-mail announcement)
- d. Update on Chicago State (plus Trustee Zollar and Zollar letter)
- e. E-mail from Grant Sterling, Re: Response to VP Nadler
- f. UPC Letter
- g. Records retention letter
- h. E-mail from Senator Ochwa-Echel, Re: Resignation
  - Ludlow - Statement in response to Grant Sterling's letter to Faculty Senators, emailed on 2/24/15. Given that Grant Sterling's "personal letter" to Faculty Senators of 2/24/15 precipitated the resignation from Faculty Senate of a Senator of color, I thought it necessary to respond. I met with three students last week, all presidents of registered student organizations whose memberships are largely students of color. Two of the student presidents told me about the letter. One had seen it; the other described it. The third was caught completely off guard, and she was angry. "Why," she asked me, "should we do anything to try to improve the climate of our campus if our faculty don't even have our backs?" I had no good answer for her beyond, "You're right. I'm sorry."

So, in the interest of having their backs, I enter this statement into the minutes of this meeting.

First, I want publicly to apologize to all of you for not saying these things at our last meeting. I had them in my head. I was frankly relieved when the conversation turned from "minority recruitment" to classroom practice, and I participated happily in that comfortable conversation, safe behind my own white and educated privilege. I am sorry I did not demonstrate that faculty have the students' backs then.

I acknowledge that Grant's letter was sent as a personal correspondence. The student who was angry understood this, too. She did not say, "Faculty Senate doesn't have our backs"; she said, "our faculty." The line between myself as an individual faculty member and my position on this body is permeable, particularly

when I am communicating with this body. Each one of us, in our daily work, represents—symbolizes—“faculty” at EIU, even when we are not representing—standing in for—all faculty.

My impression is that most faculty at EIU care deeply about our teaching and about our students. We know they need us to have their backs, to believe in their potential. We all deserve for our Faculty Senate Chair to understand this and to represent the best we as faculty can offer to all our students.

Grant’s letter claims that EIU recruits African American students who are not qualified (based on ACT scores) to be here. It implies that their lack of qualification “hurts our enrollment situation even more” because they are likely to drop out. I see this a little differently. I think there is a world of difference between not setting up a student to fail and not allowing her to try in the first place. If I have to err, I am going to err on the side of allowing her to try. After all, the same life experiences which might make the ACT a less reliable predictor of success in her case may also make her a successful student who is a delight to teach.

The most egregious argument in the letter is its first point: that an increase in enrollment of students of color has had a direct and causative effect on our decreasing overall enrollments. As evidence for this, Grant quotes, anecdotally, an unnamed guidance counselor at an unnamed high school, who said that “EIU [did]n’t want [her] students.” Grant heard this to mean “EIU . . . wasn’t interested in rural, white kids” (his words). It is, however, equally possible that her statement meant “EIU is not recruiting at my small school, so they must not be interested in my small number of college-bound students.” In other words, Grant’s explanation of her statement does not leave room for a more benign interpretation of her meaning.

Of course we should be recruiting at smaller, rural and regional, mostly-white schools as well as in larger and more diverse school systems. Chris Dearth assures us that we are, and we have no cause to disbelieve him. But much more important than that, EIU faculty should continue to welcome all students who choose EIU. The majority of us work as hard as they do toward their success, and our students can see this. Most of our students have had to struggle with something in order to be here; financial difficulties, family discomfort with college culture, racism, gender and sexual harassment, and a whole host of struggles confront our students on a regular basis. When we can show them that we believe in their ability to learn—and our ability to teach them—we have their backs and their loyalty.

#### IV. Presentations to the Senate: Senator Stowell: EIU Affordability

Stowell – This report originated from the NCA site visit report and from me being a parent of college-aged adults. Much of this data is publically available via IPEDs website. Today I want to paint a picture of where EIU stands compared to other public institutions in Illinois. Discusses Enrollment data – high school graduates. Data suggests 14-15% decline during next 15 years. Some population segments might see growth (minority, hispanic). Illinois is not the only state for projected loss in HS graduates (show US map with various states colored: Blue = loss. Yellow/Beige = growth). This impacts enrollment and revenue generated from enrollment. Another problem = Illinois is #3 in exportation of high school seniors each year. Most migration is to neighboring states in the region (and sunny Arizona!). Why do students leave? – neighboring states offer more competitive financial aid packages and higher education in Illinois is \$3000 higher annually.

- EIU Core Revenues – where does the money come from? Shows pie chart.
- Tuition and Fees – 33%. Other core revenue – 36%.
- Expenses pie chart – majority-largest piece (cost) of pie = instruction.
- Total enrollment bar graph – by institution and year – 10 year span of enrollment shown – EIU ranks 9<sup>th</sup> in total enrollment – we have lost 24% of enrollment since 2004. Most campuses have lost, but not all.
- Tuition and Fees combined – EIU ranks 7<sup>th</sup> in this category. Tuition cost at Illinois universities have nearly doubled in the past ten years.
- Total Price for first time, in-state students living on campus with dining plan – EIU ranked 6<sup>th</sup> - ~\$25,000 – has increased roughly 66% during the past 10 years. In 2004 we were 6<sup>th</sup> highest. In 2008 we were the most affordable school (10<sup>th</sup>) in terms of ‘total price’ for in-state, living on campus. Now we are 6<sup>th</sup>.

- Total cost breakdown – tuition, room & board, books, fees, other – ‘Other’ segment for ‘total cost breakdown’ for EIU is largest for any school in Illinois. Why is ‘other’ so expensive here?
- MHP – we have recently adjusted the ‘other’ cost category – we will more accurately reflect the ‘other’ indirect cost category next year (with BOT approval)
- Ashley – asks MHP for clarification on ‘other’ cost category – what’s changed regarding ‘other’?
- MHP – provides clarification. The current estimate has not been updated in awhile.
- Average Net Price of Attendance – EIU falls at the middle to lower end in terms of tuition & fees. Total cost - EIU is middle of rankings. [Cost – average amount of Financial Aid = ‘net price’]. EIU ranks 2<sup>nd</sup> highest. We were #9 in 2008. It’s possible that our Financial Aid reporting has not been as accurate as possible, which is now negatively reflected in this data.
- Stowell – refers to MHP for clarification on Financial Aid reporting process
- Stowell – also, some Illinois institutions don’t provide as much financial aid as others
- Stowell – % of students receiving financial aid – 62% - about 2/3<sup>rd</sup> - but with the net price, maybe we are not giving as much as other Illinois universities? Discusses psychological value of quality vs discount
- Stowell – ‘weighted avg cost of attendance’ – EIU is 4<sup>th</sup> in terms of total cost, in 2008 we were 9<sup>th</sup>. Stowell discussed possible impacts of adjustments to ‘other’ cost category and financial aid calculations. The financial aid recalculations alone would move EIU from 2<sup>nd</sup> highest to 4<sup>th</sup> highest.
- Dao – ask questions regarding financial aid and parental income and calculation of ‘net price’. Maybe it is possible that some Eastern students come from families that provide more household contributions?
- Stowell – 75% of EIU students receive zero contribution from family.
- Ludlow – related question – are we comfortable with the amount of EIU students that are completing FAFSAs? Do we have a high student completion rate of FAFSA?
- Lord confirms – 80% FAFSA completion rate.
- Ashley – if we reduce tuition by 20% (offer a discount) will we raise enrollment?
- Sterling – private schools have high tuition rates but almost 100% of students are given aid
- MHP – families don’t relay on sticker price, more on amount they will have to pay.
- Bruns – students look at how much am I ‘getting’ in the package.
- Ludlow – students love the ‘discount’.
- MHP – it is this time of year where financial aid packages are being released to students.
- Stowell – families are looking at total cost, specifically tuition & fees.
- Stowell – this summarizes a few reasons why EIU might be struggling with enrollment & budget problems. Some complex forces outside of our control, some inside our control. Possible solutions.
- Stowell – discusses possible solutions. \*Increase enrollment. Improve relative affordability. Reduce ‘Total Cost’. Reduce ‘other costs’ to match peers (= Total Cost reduction). Tuition discounting. Fundraising (\$17.5 mil/year). Reduce ‘Tuition’ only - It would catch the attention of IBHE, families, Illinois legislature, peer institutions, etc. Current strategy – ‘Freeze’ tuition & fees and wait. EIU3 proposal – can we reduce amount of student time on campus? – to 3 years? = reduce overall expenses. National trend of time to graduate has been increasing. This would reduce living expenses. This would get students into the job market sooner. It would attract highly motivated students.
- Stowell – displays example of EIU3 for Psych Dept. (table). Does not include minor. Summer courses could be taken online, at home, while working. Up to 27 credits of Gen Ed available online. Discusses financial aid situation during the summer. Suggests possibly change the structure of summer to 3, 4-week terms and the 8 week term. Discusses possible benefits to modifying existing summer term structure, enrollment, etc. Time EIU to think ‘outside of the box’. Some departments already exploring
- Ludlow – did you evaluate Psych faculty staffing requirements with the EIU3 proposal?
- Stowell – yes, we would have the faculty necessary.
- Dao – I think verdict is still out on in-class vs online quality. Voices concerns over online courses. Discusses past history of taking 3 courses during a summer in the past – very taxing.
- Throneburg – 20+ hours out of class work for 1 four-week class. 2 classes would be demanding.

- Stowell – EIU3 is potential marketing strategy. There is no punishment for student if it does not work.
- Stowell – EIU does not have dual credit programs. Primarily offered by junior colleges. What about EIU creating a dual credit program? Like with Charleston High School.
- Ashley – with possible cut in AP funding, high schools might like that option.
- Ludlow – in Ohio we had dual credit programs. Most students that took the classes were seniors and were high achieving. They could take course for high school or college credit, but not both.
- Mulvaney – I like the concept of EIU3, especially from a marketing perspective. I could see that resonating with families-there will be ‘savings’ here with that model – I think it would be very attractive to parents. It would be more intense, but it could save money.
- Stowell – time to degree is one of the data points in ranking of institutions as well.
- Throneburg – we use this type of model at the graduate level in CDS – provides details.
- Conwell – the first graph – the ‘other’ category is 36% - generating more than tuition? What is this category called ‘other’?
- Stowell – provides clarification on ‘other’. Lord – room and board is a large piece of ‘other’.
- Dao – I don’t have anything against EIU3 proposal. Going back to online courses – graduate students might be more motivated. Realistically, it might be a small number early. May not make a ‘dent’ in enrollment.
- Ashley – any dent is a start - helpful
- Stowell – even if it is 100 students, it could be a great start.
- Bruns – talks about relationship between EIU, Lake Land, and U of I. Also discusses U of I reducing standards which has taken some of our students. Can we arrange enrollment situation with U of I?
- Lord – many students that don’t succeed at U of I won’t be admissible at EIU – too desperate academic difficulties. But at a community college it is ‘open admissions’. You can fail out of U of I and still go to U of I. So we would need to catch new students earlier than a possible transfer from U of I.
- Dao – do we currently advertise average cost to attend EIU?
- MHP – yes, it is required by law. We focus on direct cost of attending.
- Bruns – another related situation – a transfer student knows that they have been accepted at ISU already (March) but won’t know about EIU until May. They are coming from Parkland. Maybe we need to expedite our acceptance process to match ISU? Is this something we can do/work on?
- Ludlow – this must be at the department level because that scenario does not occur in my dept.
- Mulvaney – asks about current summer structure – how/when did it come to be?
- Lord – change to current structure was made 11-12 years ago. At the time there was a 4, 4, 4 system in place. Face to face classes. Faculty were concerned about amount of class time in a 4 week structure. So changes were made to current structure. But a different context exists today versus then.
- Viertel – does university make profit off of summer students?
- Lord – when I first arrived, we were barely covering labor costs during summer term. Today due to tuition escalation, we do have a profit margin during summer term. If we grow summer, it will help overall budget.
- Conwell – but we also pay less now for faculty salaries during the summer, correct?
- Lord – yes, for 1 course, and overload rate for 2<sup>nd</sup> course. Now 78% across the board now.
- Ashley – but with online courses, you get paid more to develop and administered. (+.5 CU)
- Blitz – we agreed to a revenue-neutral number for summer terms in the most recent contract to fix large variance of compensation that existed.
- Siegel – I was here in the 4,4,4 time period. It worked for me, but it was challenging. There was variance in levels of online instruction quality. My success was very different in the two courses.
- Dao – we offer principles of ECON in the summer. Used to be 8 weeks, 6 weeks, and now 4 weeks. Last year I was asked to teach a course online – and it had to be 6 weeks, if not 8 weeks.
- Ashley – what was that recommendation based on? – where did week length come from?
- Dao – based on that person’s recommendation - experience

- Siegel – variance of my experience was based on faculty member’s mentality of online courses
- Mulvaney – I think there is some merit to EIU3, regardless of delivery format. And it does not have to be online format. From the student perspective, they could potentially take 3 separate courses, one in each time block. I think there would be merit to further discuss this.
- Stowell – it offers more flexibility, we potentially have the classes available, and the options available for students
- Throneburg – in the current 8 week session, could we not just divide the section into 2 blocks?
- Stowell – not sure with Banner?
- Lord – probably could happen, but currently discouraged
- Dao – what about writing-intensive courses
- Bruns – but with current reality, we need to something. Not just carry on ‘as is’.
- Dao – I welcome the exploration of the idea.
- Bruns – I think it’s a great idea that needs strong marketing.
- Ashley – EIU3 could increase summer offerings as well
- Stowell – to summarize, we need to be creative in our offerings in the future. There are some excellent ideas across campus relevant to our current situation. Maybe gathering minds on campus to generate creative solutions – a ‘think tank’.
- Bruns – I think the ‘think tank’ is awesome. We could bring ideas to our Illinois representative. May encourage additional funding and support from state of Illinois.
- Conwell – regarding tuition discounts – what would happen if we lowered tuition – even 1%? Has it been studied?
- Lord – hard to study/analyze without doing. Not many have done it.
- Conwell – how do companies do it?
- Dao – discusses how businesses analyze price cutting on products
- Sterling – problem is some companies are turning a profit – more freedom to experiment. EIU can’t afford a loss.
- MHP – yes, you can reduce tuition rate. Uncertain what the impact would be on overall revenue.
- Stowell – Discusses U of Illinois-Springfield case study in terms of lowering total cost and a larger study involving tuition reduction.
- Lord – U of I-S is a significant player in online education.

## V. Old Business

### A. Committee Reports:

1. Executive = no report
2. Nominations = no report
3. Elections = no report
4. Faculty-Student relations = no report
5. Faculty-Staff relations = no report
6. Awards = no report
7. Faculty Forum = no report

8. Budget transparency = Ashley – if you have Qs for VP of Business Affairs, let me know – meeting coming soon

9. Constitution and Bylaws Review = Approval of Constitutional Revisions

- Sterling introduces constitutional amendments. Most authored by Senator Scher = sick today. Some are trivial some are substantive. How should we move forward on these? We all have already reviewed and discussed them at a previous faculty senate meeting.

- Ashley – let's move through them one at a time
- Sterling reviews proposal #1 – no additional discussion – vote – unanimous
- Sterling reviews proposal #2 – no additional discussion – vote – unanimous
- Sterling reviews proposal #3 – no additional discussion – trivial changes – no vote needed
- Sterling reviews proposal #4 – no additional discussion – vote – unanimous
- Sterling reviews proposal #5 – no additional discussion – vote – unanimous
- Sterling reviews proposal #6 – no additional discussion – vote – unanimous
- Sterling reviews proposal #7 – no additional discussion – vote – unanimous
- Sterling reviews proposal #8 – no additional discussion – vote – unanimous
- Sterling reviews proposal #9 – no additional discussion – vote – unanimous
- Sterling reviews proposal #10 – no additional discussion – vote – unanimous
- Sterling reviews proposal #11 – no additional discussion – vote – unanimous
- Sterling reviews proposal #12 – no additional discussion – vote – unanimous
- Sterling reviews proposal #13 – no additional discussion – vote – (10-1 <Viertel>)
- Sterling reviews proposal #14 – no additional discussion – vote – unanimous
- Sterling reviews proposal #15 – no additional discussion – trivial change – no vote needed

Ashley – asks questions about article 13. Whether or not resolutions can be given to the faculty. Sterling - provides background and justification on article 13. Fear of some faculty members that Faculty Senate WAS NOT addressing key issues to faculty. Article 13 provides a mechanism to 'force' faculty senate to address key issues. Art 13 was not added to limit faculty senate to consult.

Sterling – apart from the question from Ashley - is it the sentiment of the Senate that we can put Resolutions on the ballot without putting forth a petition to the faculty?

Conwell – I think it's a very good idea for Article 13 and to put resolutions on the Spring Elections ballot. Provides rationale and reasoning for his opinion.

Viertel – concern – if we 'open doors' to any petition from faculty, it could lead to problems for faculty senate. A mechanism exists that may not be broken.

Ashley – that is one constitutional interpretation. And what is being suggested is a different interpretation. Do differing interpretations require us to 'amend' current article?

Conwell – provides previous example from years back. "No confidence" petition was distributed regarding an administrator. Administrator wanted to see names on the petition – which stopped petition. This type of case would be a concern in this type of situation.

Ashley – Grant's explanation makes sense. I would like us to have ability to do so and consider it – possibly adopt this approach.

Conwell – provides a response. Chair calls vote on petition. Majority rules here. If a faculty petition is frivolous, it can be voted down. It won't proceed on the ballot.

Sterling – should we revisit this later?

Ashley – if we are moving forward, we need to resolve this issue

Conwell – is this a matter of altering the constitution or altering the interpretation?

Ashley – I move that with this interpretation of the Constitution, FAC SEN is allowed to propose resolutions for faculty consideration, as well as resolutions originating from the faculty.

Conwell - 2nds the motion.

Sterling – reviews the motion

Ludlow – how binding is a vote on an ‘interpretation’?

Ashley – this is ‘for the minutes’ and ‘for the record’ for future faculty senators. In the future there will be record of it.

Ludlow – remind me - why do we need to do this?

Ashley – to enhance the resolution proposal process

Viertel – part of my concern is we did not present this proposal across campus

Ashley – are you saying we can’t do this without following this process

Viertel – no – I’m not saying that.

Ashley – seeks clarification from Viertel. And then withdraws the motion

Stowell – ask for clarification on the motion from Ashley

Throneburg – provides concern about the proposed resolution. I would be uncomfortable without some parameters on it.

Ashley – provides explanation – finds it to show Throneburg

Sterling – look for article 4, section 4, and article 7- section 3 – he reviews them orally

Ashley – on it’s own

Jones – now where in there does it say anything about a ‘resolution’?

Throneburg – provides similar comment

Jones – petition is important – putting a referendum on the ballot without faculty support is like the ‘tail’ wagging the ‘dog’

Ashley – it happens on a regular basis in Springfield

Jones – if any senator has a concern, they are welcome to start a petition

Throneburg – very uncomfortable with the process of voting happening today. At CAA we are visiting 15 other counsels to discuss proposed changes.

Jones – the content of the resolution is not an issue, it is whether or not members of this body can forward resolutions to faculty without a petition.

Ludlow – the pertinent language – does Senate deliberation, election, and voting equal to the faculty at large?

Ashley – can we ask the faculty for their opinion on issues?

Ludlow – no – reviews the language of article 4 regarding the Faculty Senate.

Ashley – so rather than a resolution, maybe an advisory vote? Do we need to amend article 13? If enough opinions suggest yes.

Ludlow – but doesn’t that describe the petition process?

Ashley – most legislative bodies ask their constituents via vote – like the last election – 3 issues

Bruns – they had to get a certain number of votes to move forward

Mulvaney – if petition process is maintained, what would happen regarding presented proposals?

Ashley – if amended, it would go out with others.

Conwell – let’s go back to original intent – Faculty Senate were not bringing up specific topics that they should have been. So ‘before’ petition process for faculty was added, FAC SEN had authority to create petition on its own, but were not using it. They had the authority, but were not exercising it.

Ashley – reviews language of Article 13 - I move to amend article 13 – ‘by it’s own initiative’ or through petition of ‘20 % of faculty’. To clarify interpretation. Conwell seconds

Ludlow – point of clarification. Article 4 is about the relationship between senate and faculty.

Article 13 is about putting petition on ballot.



Ashley – suggests inserting ‘by its own initiative or regular petition mechanism’  
 Sterling – we may need to add a sentence to article 13.  
 Mulvaney – if Senate voted to approve this motion, we then interpret that we need a petition before upcoming Spring elections process?  
 Conwell – no – I think this is a clarification – I do not interpret it that way. This only clarifies.  
 Mulvaney – I think clarification is needed – but I am still hesitant.  
 Jones – if a faculty member has an initiative they have to get a petition. Why does Faculty Senate think they can do it themselves?  
 Ashley – faculty member needs petition to ‘force it’ – that is the intent of the language.  
 Bruns – this change ‘forces’ Faculty Senate to accept the petition.  
 Sterling – other discussion? None.  
 Ludlow – this is new article 12 – current article 13. Can we add sentence before we vote.  
 Bruns – are we ‘clarifying’ or ‘changing’?  
 Sterling – proposal is to amend, not just clarifying.  
 Mulvaney – clarifying - and campus will vote on this. It will be put on the ballot.  
 Ashley – referendums may be initiated by Faculty Senate or faculty petition.  
 Sterling – makes sure that everybody understand  
 Throneburg – I disagree with the motion. Provides comments and concerns.  
 Sterling – one problem is that it is not clear in the constitution.  
 Ashley – there will be adequate time to discuss this with faculty prior to upcoming Elections  
 Throneburg – presents timeline concern  
 Ludlow – 4 weeks is in the timeline for Spring Elections  
 Mulvaney – timeline for upcoming elections – ‘value’ in tabling this? – evaluating what other institutions are doing with this issue? Time for more discussion. Still time to get it on the ballot?  
 Ludlow – yes, I think we could table for two weeks.  
 Stowell – I need a few more case studies/examples to examine before voting.  
 Ashley – table it for 2 weeks might be wise  
 Sterling – table it for 2 weeks  
 Sterling – suggestion – we have 15 total amendments to the Constitution for the ballot. Some amendments might be controversial. #2 and #13 specifically. = Should we make 2 & 13 separate ballot items?  
 Conwell – are they disjointed enough?  
 Sterling – yes – they are – we will forewarn Elections committee.

10. Committee on Committees = no report

11. Other Reports:

a. Provost’s Report – limited. Had to leave half-way through today for a different meeting.

b. Other - no

B. Other Old Business:

VI. New Business

A. Future Agenda: Spring 2015 Meeting Dates:

March 24 (?)

April 7 (Faculty Development?)

April 21 (Election of Officers, CAA?)

B. Other New Business – none

VII. Adjournment – Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.